

**TOWN OF EXETER  
PLANNING BOARD  
July 23, 2020  
VIRTUAL MEETING  
DRAFT MINUTES**

**Zoom ID: 816 9300 1213**

**Phone: 1 646 558 8656**

**I. PRELIMINARIES:**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT BY ROLL CALL:** Chair Langdon Plumer, Vice-Chair Aaron Brown, Pete Cameron, Clerk, Gwen English, John Grueter, Jen Martel, Molly Cowan, Select Board Representative, Pete Steckler, Alternate, and Nancy Belanger, Alternate.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Town Planner Dave Sharples and Natural Resource Planner Kristen Murphy

**II. CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Plumer called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM and read out loud the meeting preamble which indicated that an emergency exists and the provisions of RSA 91-A:2 III (b) are being invoked. As federal, state and local officials have determined gatherings of ten or more people pose a substantial risk to the community and the meeting imperative to the continued operation of Town and government and services which are vital to public, health, safety and confidence. This meeting will be conducted without a quorum physically present in the same location and welcome members of the public accessing the meeting remotely.

**III. OLD BUSINESS**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

July 9, 2020

*Mr. Cameron motioned to accept the July 9, 2020 minutes as written. Ms. English seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, Plumer – aye, Brown – aye, English – aye, Cameron – aye, Martel – aye, Cowan – aye and Grueter - abstain. With all in favor the motion passed 6-0-1.*

June 25, 2020

*Ms. English motioned to accept the June 25, 2020 minutes as amended. Mr. Grueter seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, Plumer – aye, Brown – aye, English – aye, Cameron – aye, Martel – aye, Cowan – aye and Grueter - aye. With all in favor the motion passed 7-0-0.*

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

43 1. Continued public hearing on the application of Gateway at Exeter, LLC for a proposed lot line  
44 adjustment and subdivision at 170 Epping Road. The lot line adjustment will transfer 2.10 acres of land  
45 from Tax Map parcel #47-7 to Tax Map parcel #47-6; and subsequently a proposed subdivision of Tax  
46 Map parcel #47-7 into two lots in conjunction with a mixed use development being proposed for the  
47 site.

48 C-3 Epping Road Highway Commercial zoning district  
49 PB Case #19-15

50

51 2. Continued public hearing on the application of Gateway at Exeter, LLC for a site plan review and a  
52 Wetlands Conditional Use Permit for the proposed construction of a mixed-use development at 170  
53 Epping Road (TM #47-6 and #47-7). The proposal includes a 224-unit multi-family residential complex, a  
54 2-story 48,560 square foot mixed use building that may include a 20,040 YMCA day care facility,  
55 office/retail space and possibly a restaurant along with associated site improvements.

56 C-3 Epping Road Highway Commercial zoning district  
57 PB Case #19-16

58

59 Chair Plumer indicated there are two items the Board is working with.

60

61 Mr. Sharples indicated Case #19-15 and #19-16 were continued on June 25, 2020. The main issues were  
62 traffic and wetlands. Third party review was required and completed by GZA. The report was  
63 distributed. Tracy Tarr from GZA is here. The traffic and scoping meeting has been scheduled for next  
64 week. Jason Plourde is here for that as well. The applicant is requesting several waivers.

65

66 Ms. Cowan asked what the schedule for hearing from the public is and Chair Plumer noted after the  
67 applicant updates wetlands and traffic; afterwards the public hearing will be closed.

68

69 Mr. Petropulos indicated the report from GZA is in front of us. Have scoping meeting Thursday. Tracy  
70 Tarr went out on Tuesday to the site. The work was split up between us. Reviewed within the scope  
71 provided and viewed digital map of site for functions and values. The observations were recorded on an  
72 aerial plan.

73

74 Vernal Pools

75

76 Two vernal pools were noted. They were not highly functional but vernal pools, nonetheless, with one  
77 being deemed a potential vernal pool. The building just misses the core area. Six secondary indicators  
78 were found and there is no fill or grading proposed in that area.

79

80 Ms. Tarr noted connectivity is important especially for vernal pool species. Excited to see the protection  
81 of these vernal pools. Travel corridor maintenance would be great.

82

83 Mr. Steckler asked if connectivity is cut off further to the east and if mitigation efforts are cut off? Ms.  
84 Tarr opined the mitigation package is appropriate. Could encourage more connectivity in other areas.  
85 Route 27 is a major separation of connectivity. Thomas Leonard indicated he planned to respond to  
86 some of these statements.

87

88 Vegetation

89

90 Ms. Tarr noted she observed common iris and common white oak on the site, but none of the protected  
91 species mentioned within the scope. A few recommendations were given for design.

92

93 Mr. Steckler noted he appreciated the work. He stated that the function of having wildlife habitats on  
94 site was very important, therefore the wetlands could not possibly be low value. Confirmed vernal pool  
95 changes uniqueness of the wetlands.

96

97 Ms. Tarr noted wildlife are important functions also but the remaining part of the property has  
98 substantial wildlife so she did not feel that changed the impact for this area.

99

100 Eileen Flockhart indicated she had something prepared in writing, but it does not pertain to wetlands  
101 and traffic. Mr. Sharples noted it depends on the closure of the public hearing and asked her to email it  
102 to him so it can be read into the record.

103

104 Mr. Leonard stated review shows Mr. Quigley did an excellent job out there. Willing to work with the  
105 potential vernal pool. The real focus is on this small area by Epping Road. Doesn't seem directly  
106 impacted. Balancing efforts of public safety and wetland protection. Started with 60 acres of land.  
107 Minimized footprint and protect most important assets. ZBA agreed we should move things to the front  
108 to protect the wetlands. This particular pool is not as important as others that are being protected in  
109 the back acreage. Hope we can move to the next step without any substantial impact to the present  
110 project.

111

112 Mr. Steckler indicated the discussion is not about one small wetland, about understanding impacts.  
113 Concerned about the extent of wetlands and resources available.

114

115 Traffic

116

117 Chair Plumer recommended the Board review the traffic study.

118

119 Stephen Pernaw indicated there was nothing new traffic wise. Still awaiting scoping meeting and will  
120 have more to add then.

121

122 Mr. Sharples noted Eileen Flockhart submitted a letter. She looked into the project further and is  
123 concerned that the project is huge in scale. Waivers for planting and impervious surface are not  
124 appropriate. Hopes solar will be used for residential and commercial. Also concerned that mostly one  
125 to two-bedroom apartments and is curious about rent costs with 56 workforce units planned.

126

127 Mr. Cameron asked if workforce is spread between buildings or concentrated in one? Mr. Leonard  
128 noted that 25% of each building's units will be affordable housing. Won't just build the market value and  
129 then move on. Workforce requires 30% of income. Must be affordable to families with 60% of median  
130 income. Is a diverse housing stock. Assistance in financing is available. Allows for continuing change in

131 occupancy. The project is right next to Route 101. ZBA asked to restrict on record. Phasing is only in a  
132 construction sense. Plan is to have one financing package to three buildings.

133

134 Mr. Sharples indicated a letter from Lindsay Sonnett recommending cautious endorsement.

135

136 Mr. Sharples noted affordable housing restrictions could be in perpetuity. Want to attract and retain  
137 workforce. Jim Petropulos clarified workforce housing is for 40 years.

138

139 Chair Plumer reported support letters from several entities revolving around workforce housing. One  
140 being from Sig Sauer who indicated it assists in attracting new employees. Town Manager letter states  
141 this approval would greatly help with Town Master Plan efforts and support for workforce housing. It  
142 ensures remainder of TIF road development to be a success.

143

144 Mr. Leonard indicated he believed commercial should remain 48,000 SF if Board thought that would be  
145 comfortable. Can't have as a condition because of finance requirements. Open to state and local input  
146 on traffic corridor improvements. Have to come to an agreement. Will it support traffic light? All  
147 depends on scoping meeting. Are open to having that be a condition to work with then to solve any  
148 issues. Believe are ready for approval.

149

150 Ms. Flockhart asked about solar panels? Mr. Leonard indicated workforce housing units don't support  
151 construction costs of solar panels. Can't make commitment to that because of costs. Energy footprint is  
152 important. If are economically viable would love to consider them.

153

154 Tom Monahan indicated also owners of Garrison Glenn. Will not be using natural gas, all electric to help  
155 footprint.

156

157 Ms. Martel indicated what she hears from the traffic meeting may change a lot of what we're seeing.

158 Ms. Martel indicated she is supportive to hearing about the remaining waivers.

159

160 Mr. Grueter noted the design of buildings changed. Mr. Petropulos indicated after hearing comments,  
161 received new perspectives yesterday to show. A reduction in size of top building, lowered roof of  
162 commercial building, changed stone finish on apartments, adjusted gables, shows the 38,000 SF but  
163 would be the same principals for the larger footprints Elevations are part of Site Plan Review. If have  
164 substantial changes would have to come back to you.

165

166 Mr. Steckler asked to weigh in on conditions of CUP. Proposed impact can't be detrimental to values of  
167 wetland. Its just a restatement of functions and values. Design and maintenance should minimize  
168 impact and no alternate design can be feasible. Scale and configuration is unsuitable. Can't pose hazard  
169 due to loss of wetlands or contamination. Absorb precipitation. Several areas of flood hazards  
170 downstream of this project. Think about broader impacts to Town. Don't see the values as low value.

171

172 Ms. Tarr noted "low value" as a general term for wetlands, does not encompass entire wetlands'  
173 functions.

174

175 Ms. Belanger asked about final input on parking in the back area (originally designated as trail parking)?  
176 Mr. Sharples noted initially had some spots designated for that area. Conservation Commission did not  
177 feel appropriate to have them there. Looking for alternatives. Does not prohibit public access.  
178 Conservation is not all for human activities. Not every landscape suitable for trails. Ms. Belanger noted  
179 it is important to publicize as it is.

180  
181 Ms. Murphy indicated it does recognize that the public will use the land. The only place for viable trail is  
182 impacted logging road. Is a similar project that doesn't have designated parking.

183  
184 Ms. Belanger asked if any indicators for the possible trail and Ms. Murphy noted she did not believe the  
185 trail relocation has been submitted.

186  
187 Mr. Petropulos noted that area is off our property. Ms. Murphy noted a large wetland complex next to  
188 the lot.

189  
190 Ms. English indicated she did not feel trail parking is needed. Clarify it will be there or not. Agree with  
191 the Conservation Commission. Allowing public use, just not advertising the area. Mr. Sharples indicated  
192 there is just general parking there now, not for trails.

193  
194 Mr. Grueter asked if it was determined there was extra parking? Mr. Petropulos indicated yes and no  
195 plans to reduce as of now.

196  
197 Mr. Leonard noted a reduction in footprint would reduce parking. The extra is not based on Town  
198 regulations, it was off our ULI calculations. Would like to comment on CUP criteria. Heard from a  
199 number of people that rear portion is very significant and sensitive. Contiguous to other private  
200 property. Footprint of buildings substantially smaller than industrial buildings. Minimized footprint.  
201 When designing drainage structures have to make sure the water in site does not result in more water  
202 leaving site. Mr. Petropulos noted providing basins for stormwater. Design has been reviewed by  
203 several parties.

204  
205 Ms. English indicated when established TIF think intention was to establish commercial use here. Think  
206 should decide between 38,000-48,000 footprints. Encourage 38,000 to protect more of the land.

207  
208 Ms. Martel noted the ULI study came up with 270 spaces necessary. Support removing six spaces in the  
209 back. Seems like excess pavement.

210  
211 Vice-Chair Brown indicated Ms. English summarized his concern about commercial space. Concerned  
212 about development of corridor as well. In favor of 48,000 feet footprint. This is mostly residential.  
213 Don't want to see commercial area be unbuilt as is a trend lately. Hopefully can allow applicant to get  
214 funding while still able to follow through with the commercial aspect.

215  
216 Mr. Leonard noted 48,000 will not have additional impact to wetlands. Ms. English asked if there were  
217 other reductions that could be made? Vice-Chair Brown recommended leaving it to the applicant to  
218 decide. Vice-Chair Brown indicated he feels commercial piece is vital.

219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262

Ms. Cowan noted in TIF the objective includes mixed residential opportunity. Understand frustration with other aspects of business. Do believe this would meet TIF requirements if gets built. Any way to ensure that every piece gets developed at the same time.

Vice-Chair Brown noted the only way to ensure that is to either make a COA or make them bond. Happy that they're prepared to go with 48,000 feet.

Mr. Grueter asked how the Board could ensure commercial is built? Mr. Sharples noted a COA or a building permit but don't believe applicant is in favor of either.

Mr. Steckler indicated he felt approval of CUP for this project sets precedent for similar projects.

Chair Plumer closed the meeting to the public at 9:28 PM.

Vice-Chair Brown indicated he did not think the Board could vote until the traffic study is complete in case things change.

Ms. English asked about the recreation impact fee? Greg Bisson a year ago stated that more recreation activities were encouraged.

Mr. Grueter agreed there doesn't look to be enough.

Mr. Sharples noted he has a waiver for both recreation space and recreation impact fees. Ms. English noted the pool is only enough during the summer.

Vice-Chair Brown indicated normally have waivers read into the record first, good points made.

Vice-Chair Brown asked the rationale for the recreation impact fee waiver? Mr. Leonard noted donating back 40 acres which is more than required for mitigation. Vice-Chair Brown asked if donating was part of variance consideration? Mr. Leonard noted he felt it was. Thought would be connected to trail system for recreational use. We understand what we were doing but we also accept the decisions by Conservation Commission and this Board.

Vice-Chair Brown noted good arguments were made. Would be inclined to grant for recreation space but not the impact fee. Think that conveyed land is overvalued.

Mr. Grueter asked how much land for recreation space waiver? Mr. Leonard indicated 400 feet per unit, approximately 2.5 acres. Mr. Grueter noted there is no other green space for recreation, is very limited. Mr. Petropulos noted there is reasonable space south of Building C.

Ms. Murphy noted Conservation Commission was supportive of a trail on Conservation land. Still a trail to provide outdoor space. Chair Plumer asked if Conservation Commission considered recreation for residents? Ms. Murphy indicated yes, didn't want to establish a high traffic conservation area. Is a

263 decent amount of trail space. Could propose a condition that includes trail design and involvement by  
264 Conservation Commission.

265  
266 Mr. Cameron noted progress tonight has not been enough and may need an extra meeting. Focus on  
267 backlogged applications. Chair Plumer noted a special meeting could be held on August 20 to wrap up  
268 Gateway. Mr. Sharples noted August 6<sup>th</sup> is a possibility.

269  
270 *Vice-Chair Brown moved to continue Planning Board Cases #19-15 and #19-16 to a special meeting on*  
271 *August 20, 2020 at 7:00 PM. Mr. Cameron seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, Plumer –*  
272 *aye, Brown – aye, English – aye, Cameron – aye, Martel – aye, Cowan – aye and Grueter - aye. With*  
273 *all in favor the motion passed 7-0-0.*

274  
275 3. Continuation of the application of Brian Griset for review of a Yield Plan in conjunction with a  
276 proposed 16-unit single-family condominium open space development and associated site  
277 improvements on property located off Tamarind Lane and Cullen Way.

278 R-1 Low Density Residential and NP-Neighborhood Professional zoning districts  
279 Tax Map Parcel S #96-15 and #81-53  
280 Case #20-2

281  
282 Chair Plumer indicated Case #20-2 was requested to be continued to July 23<sup>rd</sup> but it doesn't look like the  
283 Board will get to it tonight.

284  
285 Attorney Justin Pasay indicated they welcomed a continuance to the next available date and requests  
286 being put first on the agenda for that meeting.

287  
288 *Vice-Chair Brown motioned to continue the Griset Yield Plan, Case #20-2 to August 27, 2020 at 7:00*  
289 *PM. Mr. Cameron seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, Plumer – aye, Brown – aye,*  
290 *English – aye, Cameron – aye, Martel – aye, Cowan – aye and Grueter - aye. With all in favor the*  
291 *motion passed 7-0-0.*

292  
293 **V. OTHER BUSINESS**

294  
295 **VI. TOWN PLANNER'S ITEMS**

296 **Field Modifications**

297 **Announcements**

298 **VII. CHAIRPERSON'S ITEMS**

299 Chair Plumer indicated the next meeting would be August 13, 2020 at 6pm for CIP business and  
300 other new applications.

301 **VIII. PB REPRESENTATIVE'S REPORT ON "OTHER COMMITTEE ACTIVITY"**

302 **IX. ADJOURN**

303 *Vice-Chair Brown moved to adjourn at 10:06 PM. Mr. Grueter seconded the motion. A roll call vote*  
304 *was taken, Plumer – aye, Brown – aye, English – aye, Cameron – aye, Martel – aye, Cowan – aye and*  
305 *Grueter - aye. With all in favor the motion passed 7-0-0.*

306

307 Respectfully submitted,

308 Daniel Hoijer,

309 Recording Secretary